

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Weshington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/688,328	10/13/2000	Shahzad Ebrahimian	12568US04	1219
759	0 03/31/2003			
Robert W Fieseler McAndrews Held & Malloy Ltd 500 West Madison Street			EXAMINER	
			SZEKELY, PETER A	
34th Floor Chicago, IL 60661			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
<b>3</b> /			1714	
			DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				mk-13	
s)		Application N .	Applicant(s)	,,,,,,	
ri. And		09/688,328	EBRAHIMIAN ET	EBRAHIMIAN ET AL.	
Offic Action Su	mmary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Peter Szekely	1714		
The MAILING DATE of Period f r Reply	this communication a	ppears on the cover shet	with the correspondence ac	ddress	
A SHORTENED STATUTOR' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS  - Extensions of time may be available unafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing - If the period for reply specified above is - If NO period for reply is specified above - Failure to reply within the set or extende - Any reply received by the Office later th	S COMMUNICATION der the provisions of 37 CFR date of this communication. less than thirty (30) days, a re- the period for renly will by state	N.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may eply within the statutory minimum of od will apply and will expire SIX (6) N tute, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered time MONTHS from the mailing date of this of a ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	oly. communication.	
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Status	CFR 1.704(b).	•			
1) Responsive to commu	nication(s) filed on 2	5 February 2 <u>003</u> .			
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .		This action is non-final.			
3) Since this application i	s in condition for allo	wance except for formal r	matters, prosecution as to the	he merits is	
closed in accordance v	with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935	C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pe	nding in the applicat	ion.			
4a) Of the above claim(	s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are a	llowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rej	ected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are o					
8) Claim(s) are sub	ject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is obje	-		ou the Evernines		
10) The drawing(s) filed on					
Applicant may not reque			beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). □ disapproved by the Examir		
		reply to this Office action.	_ disapproved by the Extrim		
12) The oath or declaration i					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119	-				
13) Acknowledgment is ma		ion priority under 35 U.S.	C & 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) [		igh phoney and or or o.o.			
, ,		ents have been received.			
			n Application No		
3. Copies of the cer application from	tified copies of the poor the International	riority documents have be Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a	een received in this Nationa ))).	l Stage	
* See the attached detailed				al application)	
14) Acknowledgment is made				а арриовиопу.	
a) ☐ The translation of the 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is mad		provisional application hatestic priority under 35 U.S			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-8     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra     Information Disclosure Statement(s	awing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice	iew Summary (PTO-413) Paper Nee of Informal Patent Application (P		

Application/Control Number: 09/688,328

Art Unit: 1714

**3** 

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 2. Claims1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no mention in the specification of a composition having a limited oxygen index in the range of 45% to 65%. Only a range of 45.5% to 62% is shown. Even "in the range of 45.4% to 62.1%" would be new matter.
- 3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an oxygen index range of 45.5% to 62%, does not reasonably provide enablement for a range of 45% to 65%. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. See Table I.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 5. Claims 1-9, 11, 14-20, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibilia 5,310,775, in view of Beall et al. 5,578,672, further in view of Kawasumi et al. 4,810,734, Vaia et al. 5,955,535 or Ellsworth 5,962,553.

Art Unit: 1714

(S)

6. Claims 10, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibilia 5,310,775, in view of Beall et al. 5,578,672, further in view of Kawasumi et al. 4,810,734, Vaia et al. 5,955,535 or Ellsworth 5,962,553, and even further in view of Kutnyak et al. 4,356,284 or Thulliez et al. 6,054,538.

7. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibilia et al. 5,310,775, in view of Beall et al. 5,578,672, further in view of Kawasumi et al. 4,810,734, Vaia et al. 5,955,535 or Ellsworth 5,962,553, and even further in view of Day et al. 6,217,197 or Day et al. 6,355,277.

# Response to Arguments

- 8. Applicant's arguments filed 2/25/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants' amendments contain new matter and they are not enabled by the specification. Awaiting the removal of the new matter and the not enabled parts of the claims, all rejections made in Paper #8 are maintained in their entirety.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is (703) 308-2460. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 a.m-5:30 p.m. Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 09/688,328

Art Unit: 1714

Peter Szekely Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

P.S. March 27, 2003